sides have been trying very hard to work out an amendment that would be agreeable to everyone here. As I understand it, they are very close.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think we have one that we can clear here. It also is one that maybe the Senator in the chair would have some interest in.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE METRIC CONVERSION ACT OF 1975

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2779, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2779) to provide for appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 5417

(Purpose: To provide for appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects, and for other purposes)

Mr. LOTT. Senator BURNS has a substitute amendment at the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] for Mr. BURNS, for himself, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GLENN, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. WARNER, Mr. ROBB, Mr. SHELBY, and Mr. GRAMS proposes amendment numbered 5417.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I am happy to report today that the Senate is ready to pass legislation, H.R. 2779, designed to protect American businesses, American jobs, and the American taxpayers by providing for the appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects. I was pleased both to introduce the Senate version of this measure, S. 1386, last fall along with my colleague Senator SHELBY, and to lead the effort in the Senate to obtain bipartisan approval here. This legislation restores a degree of sensibility and sanity to the manner in which this country gradually converts to the metric system. It is good for small business.

Bright and forward-thinking people have told me they believe the metric system is the future of this country. I will take them at their word. But there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that there is a right way and a wrong way to bring about metric conversion. The right way is to work cooperatively with everyone who will be affected by metric conversion. The right way is to convert without unduly burdening businesses, without losing markets for U.S. firms, without forcing the taxpayers to pay a metric premium when Federal agencies procure metric products that are specialty items, not off-the shelf commercial items. The wrong way is to do precisely the opposite, which, unfortunately, has been happening.

The 1988 Trade bill contained language which established the metric system as the preferred system of measurement for the United States. Why was the language on the trade bill? The rationale was that it would improve the ability of American companies to export goods to metric-based countries if American firms could be moved to produce those goods in metric versions.

The principal tool for urging American companies to switch to the metric system is to use Government procurement policy. The trade bill includes language, ''to require that each Federal agency, by a date certain and to the extent economically feasible by the end of the fiscal year 1992, use the metric system of measurement in its procurement, grants, and other business-related activities . . .''

This legislation is being passed today because some Federal agencies responsible for implementing the metric policy either forgot to read or are completely ignoring the remainder of the above sentence: ''. . . except to the extent that such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms, such as when foreign competitors are producing competing products in non-metric units . . .''

Congress never intended for the switch to metrication to be forced at any cost or without regard to its impact on people, small business, or industry. This legislation insures that the Federal construction procurement policy will no longer ignore this important language which, in turn, can cause staggering problems for some industries.

We also need to keep in mind at the outset that metrication policy is rapidly running into conflict with other Government policies calling for the use of commercial products widely available in the private sector. Federal contracting personnel need to closely review procurement law developments such as the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act [FASA] to ensure that, in their fervor to bring about metrication through Federal procurement, they are not inadvertently violating key elements of procurement laws and policies designed to promote the use of widely available commercial products and maximum access to the commercial market place.

Let me briefly describe some of the finer points of the legislation, and send a very clear signal to the agencies as to how the law is to be interpreted and applied.

Agencies have begun to hide behind metric law to maintain Government unique specifications and the internal support staff needed to maintain the Government unique specifications. At the same time, Government procurement laws and procedures have been streamlined to require agencies to buy commercial items. In addition, some advocates were pushing the use of metrics without consideration of costs and industry impact, as required by the 1988 amendments. This substitution amendment to H.R. 2779 clearly states that procurement laws favoring commercial off-the-shelf items will be applied and certainly will not be overridden or avoided by the application of the metric law and policy. Where there is conflict between the two, procurement laws favoring commercial off-the-shelf items customarily used by the private sector will take precedence. This allows an orderly transition to items built in hard-metric configuration, when those items meet the economic and quality specifications of the commercial marketplace.

FASA requires agencies to conduct preliminary market research to make sure they can obtain commercial items. This amendment to H.R. 2779 says the results of that market research must be used to determine which design method is suitable to ensure that the design will accommodate commercial items. It would make no sense whatsoever for an agency to design a building requiring hard-metric components after it has learned that hard-metric construction items that meet the definitional requirements in this amendment for commercial items are not available. Consistent with FASA, my legislation requires that agencies determine early in the process whether hard-metric or soft-metric building materials are available. Even in a metric building, the design must accommodate non-hard-metric items if hard-metric versions of those products are not available as commercial, off-the-shelf, items.

Hard-metrication for two classes of construction products has been particularly controversial: concrete masonry units [CMU] and lighting fixtures. The problems these industries are facing are well documented so I will not recount them here. The treatment for both classes is virtually identical, except that there is an extra criterion relating to voluntary industry consensus standards that would be inappropriate to apply with CMU. This legislation allows agencies to use the metric system of measurement but they may not incorporate specifications that can only be satisfied by hard-metric versions of these products

in solicitations for design and construction of Federal facilities unless certain criteria are met.

One of the chief problems we are remedying in this amendment is that agencies have been using hard-metric specifications for CMU and recessed lighting fixtures to greatly hinder or eliminate offerors of soft-metric versions of these products from the opportunity to win contracts by rendering them nonresponsive because solely hard-metric versions have been specified. To address the problem of these two industries, the amendment specifically requires a determination by an agency head if the agency requires a contractor to design or build to hard metric specifications for CMU and lighting fixtures. In the provisions directly addressing CMU and recessed lighting fixtures, an agency solicitation ''may not incorporate specifications that can only be satisfied by hard-metric versions''. Congress' intent is that an agency can solicit offers in hard-metric, soft-metric or English standards but if it limits offers to hard-metric, the agency head must make a determination using the procedures laid out in sections (b) and (c) of this amendment to H.R. 2779.

This language does not allow agencies to incorporate hard-metric specifications in a piecemeal manner to justify and specify hard-metric CMU and lighting fixtures in an entire project. In other words, a partial hard-metric specification may not be used to justify a hard-metric requirement for an entire project.

Even in those cases where agencies might be allowed to use a hard-metric design and hard-metric products after the full and appropriate application of this act, we would encourage the agencies to use value-engineering principles, which have the full support of Congress, to use soft-metric products where possible to reduce the costs to the taxpayers and incur all the benefits of the value-engineering concept.

Regarding the criterion that the application requires hard-metric CMU or lighting fixtures to coordinate dimensionally into 100-millimeter building modules, I would reiterate that the preliminary market research should decide the design method, and the design method would have a very large impact on whether a 100-millimeter module is necessary or even allowable to comport with soft-metric versions of either of these products. It is quite possible that it might be a rare event that such a module would be required. The term ''required'' in this criterion means that an agency must use the 100-millimeter module to avoid otherwise not resolvable technical problems, and that other reasonable, low-cost or low-effort minor adjustments or solutions are unavailable. In other words, a bona fide requirement for a 100-millimeter module based on technical necessity is implied as a requirement for this criterion to be satisfied.

I would call attention to the criterion that states the total installed price of hard-metric CMU and lighting fixtures must cost less than the non-hard-metric versions. Estimates shall be prepared using pricing data or price analyses with data from similar projects as defined in the Truth in Negotiations Act. Estimates should be prepared very carefully with a strong emphasis on using pricing data and price analysis on actual projects in being where actual costs to the taxpayers can be obtained and compared. The most recent data available to provide the most accurate estimate possible should be sought; the emphasis is on the actual pricing that the Government pays. Because the method and information used are the basis for determining what the Government will buy, Congress expects ombudsmen, the GAO, and others to scrutinize these factors carefully if complaints are received relating to price estimates. Agency personnel who conduct estimates for this subsection should retain a detailed record of factors affecting their decisions and be prepared to provide such documentation.

The designation of agency ombudsman is a reflection that either no appeals method to review actions of agency metrication decision exists, or if it does exist, it doesn't work. The CMU and lighting fixture industries have been working for years to persuade a change in Federal policy on metrication, to no avail. The key points to make about the ombudsman is that this person should be sufficiently highly placed in an agency so as to have agencywide authority, and sufficient resources to be able to quickly communicate the resolutions of complaints throughout the agency. A suitable ombudsman will be sufficiently insulated from the contracting process to remain objective. In order to effectively analyze complaints, the ombudsmen must maintain knowledge of both metrication and procurement laws, as the top-level business-related activities of the agency.

The ombudsmen should act aggressively, quickly and affirmatively to deal with complaints. They should thoroughly examine the documentary record, especially with regard to cost estimates. The CMU and lighting fixtures industries may avail themselves of the ombudsman if necessary at any time prior to the expiration of this act. It is expected that ombudsmen will genuinely review the actions of the contracting personnel which are the subject of complaints. Ombudsmen should endeavor to recommend agency-wide solutions in cases where it is readily apparent that the conditions giving rise to complaints are not localized or could be repeated.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks as to specific provisions in this legislation. I urge agency contracting personnel to understand the spirit as well as the letter of legislation and I hope that they will adhere to both equally. Mr. President, without objection, I would like to submit newspaper articles that further chronicle the details of the problem that brings us to the Senate floor today to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to thank my very good friends for their help and very responsive assistance in developing improvements to the bill and moving it quickly for the benefit of many American businesses, workers and taxpayers. Senator RICHARD SHELBY was an original cosponsor of S.1386. Senator LARRY PRESSLER has always shown tireless leadership in standing up for the concerns of everyday people on this issue, and I thank him for his support. Many thanks go to my Senate colleagues on both the Governmental Affairs and the Commerce Committees, especially Senators TED STEVENS and JOHN GLENN for their indispensable expertise on procurement issues, and Senator ERNEST HOLLINGS for his contributions to the bill in time for final passage. Not only have my colleagues contributed their support, but their very fine staffs including Timothy Kyger, Patrick Windham, Mark Forman, John Pettit, Debbie Cohen Lehrich and Sebastian O'Kelley have worked hard in support of this effort and should be acknowledged. Mark Forman with the Governmental Affairs Committee staff proved to be an invaluable source of procurement law and technical knowledge of FASA.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that relevant material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Investor's Business Daily, Jan. 4, 1996]

MOVING TO METRIC MAY HARM CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTORS

(By Carl Horowitz)

Conversion to the metric system may not fit the mold—literally. That could be costing contractors, and ultimately taxpayers, extra.

That's the view of Sens. Conard Burns. R-Mont., and Richard Shelby. R-Ala., in the Senate, and Rep. Chris Cox, R-Calif., in the House.

The lawmakers have sponsored similar bills that would clarify the intent of the National Metric Conversion Act of 1975. That law in part, requires bids on federal construction contracts to be in metric form.

The intent of the bills is to reduce the compliance burden on firms. Supporters say in the absence of such action, federal agencies will continue making the 1975 law into an unfunded mandate, despite lacking statutory authority. They add that these agencies are ignoring some basic economics of construction.

The issue comes down to definition.

Federal contractors until recently submitted bids by converting English-derived ''inch-pound'' measures into fractional metric equivalents. This process, known as ''soft metric conversion,'' requires only minor design and marketing changes.

But agencies in the past couple of years have made contractors express metric figures as whole numbers. This is ''hard metric conversion.''

The Senate and House bills would ban federal procurement of hard-metric modular

building materials, including flooring, ceilings, and wallboard. As long as English-measure product is available, and as long as hard-metric use would cost more than $25,000, a firm could not be forced to use hard-metric standards.

In 1991 President Bush issued an executive order requiring federal agencies to develop goals and timetables to complete a conversion to the whole metric system.

Agencies agreed to begin instituting hard-metric measures by January 1994, and did so ahead of schedule.

The ''soft vs. hard'' distinction seems minor. For one thing, federal contracts make up only about 5% of U.S. building construction. For another, it appears to be just a question of plugging in numbers.

But appearances are misleading, says Randall Pence, director of government relations for the National Concrete Masonry Association, a Herndon, VA.-based trade group.

Pence argues full conversion would inflate bids and inventory costs, making concrete masonry producers less competitive. Putting metric figures in round numbers would require redesigning concrete masonry products from scratch.

''Using whole metric numbers would force us to make a standard 8″ by 8″ by 16″ block an eighth of an inch smaller,'' he said.

That change would necessitate making new block molds at $10,000 to $300,000 per mold, hitting small firms the hardest.

''Producers tell me it would cost on average between $250,000 and $300,000 to buy a complete compliment of hard metric molds. If our entire industry had to shift to hard-metric conversion, it would cost $250 million to $500 million. And we'd get a product no more durable, fire-resistant or energy-efficient,'' remarked Pence.

He noted a few cases of how hard-metric use can inflate bids—or how soft-metric use can lower them.

At a House Science subcommittee hearing, Rep. Connie Morella, R-Md., revealed a General Accounting Office cost estimate of a new lab building for the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Hard-metric standards would add 20% to 25% to project costs, the GAO said.

A deletion of the hard-metric requirement lowered average bids on a courthouse project in Kansas City, Mo., by some $17 million, a more than 15% decrease.

Pence worries contractors might not find suppliers.

Among 32 potential suppliers for a Centers for Disease Control building, none made hard-metric block, he said. A recent NCMA member survey revealed only one respondent among nearly 400 made hard-metric block.

But the NCMA exaggerates, says architect Bill Brenner, executive director of the Construction Metrication Council.

''Only a handful of projects will ever have to use hard-metric measures. And the new bills before Congress, if anything, will raise contractor cots,'' he said.

Brenner added if the legislation became law, it would favor one industry type over others, block new technologies, and undermine America' position in a metric-oriented global economy.

Brenner admits hard-metric mandates might harm smaller firms. Thus, he urges federal agencies to continue their ''go-slow'' approach.

Pence says that the council's end goal is universal hard-metric use. A December draft report by the council lends support to his view.

''It is only a matter of time before the U.S. construction industry, which accounts for 6 million jobs and 8% of the gross national product, joins the nation's automobile, health care, and electronics industries (among others) in completely converting to the metric system,'' the report read.

THE REGULATORS: BUILDING A CASE FOR EXEMPTION

BLOCKMAKERS FIND NO CONCRETE REASON TO GO METRIC

(By Cindy Skrzycki)

The concrete block industry hates to be hard-headed about it, but it absolutely refuses to make its blocks fit the government's specifications for using metric measurements in federal construction projects.

Led by the National Concrete Masonry Association, a collection of smaller-sized companies that make concrete blocks, the industry is pushing legislation to exempt concrete block and recessed-lighting fixture makers from retooling to make the slight size modifications that go along with becoming ''hard metric.''

''We don't like to be the skunk at the picnic . . . but the idea of forcing the concrete block industry to go hard metric is just ludicrous,'' said Randall Pence, director of government relations for the National Concrete Masonry Association. ''There's no private market interest in this.''

Hard metric?

Most people I know couldn't convert a mile to a kilometer if you offered them a million dollars. And they sure wouldn't know there is a metric pecking order. But here it is:

The United States primarily uses the English standard of inches and pounds. The nation has been trying to convert to the metric system gradually since 1975. This conversion means specific things to people who carry around tape measures and calculators: ''Soft'' metric means simply relabeling measurements in metric units. ''Hard'' metric means physically changing the size of the product to rounded metric measurements.

Because concrete blocks and recessed light fixtures are coordinated with other products, they won't fit in the new metric world unless the molds used to make the blocks and the machines used to make the fixtures are changed. Concrete blocks now being produced are one-eighth of an inch higher than a hard-metric concrete block. What is now 7.58 inches (194 millimeters) would have to be refigured to 7.48 inches (or 190 millimeters) to become hard metric.

The industry said that if all its producers bought new molds, it could cost as much as $500 million. That's big money to the thousands of block producers. The profit margin on each block now is about 2 cents.

The industry group claims that producers would be forced to keep two inventories—one for government jobs and one for private builders. It predicted mix-ups in which the wrong-sized block would get shipped to a job because, to the untrained eye, the size difference is indistinguishable. But to the engineer on the job, mixing English with hard metric is like trying to build something with both Legos and their larger-sized Duplo cousins. It comes out looking like an East Bloc apartment building.

The association said it has been pleading its case for several years with the Construction Metrication Council, a collection of government construction experts who are the high priests metric conversion.

William Brenner, director of the council, said he and others are sympathetic to the block executives, but an outright exemption is not the way to go. ''Federal agencies should be able to use whatever is rational,'' Brenner said. He noted that in most cases, going metric has been smooth and relatively inexpensive.

Pence said changes that the General Services Administration and the council tried to make to accommodate the industry have been ignored by federal project managers. So the association went to Rep. Christopher Cox (R–Calif.), who sponsored a bill to get concrete and lighting off the metric hook.

The House Science Committee agreed on the bill June 26 and the association hopes to get similar support in the Senate.

The industry and Cox relied on a provision in the 1988 Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act, which said the United States should go metric ''except to the extent that such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms. . . .''

In the end, the association predicts that if the government continues to take a hard line, it will have to pay a metric premium. Of course, the United States could buy from Mexico and Canada. They already use hard-metric molds for concrete blocks.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to congratulate Senator BURNS for his leadership on the Savings in Construction Act of 1996. Senator BURNS' original version of the bill, S. 1386, was referred to the Governmental Affairs Committee, which I chair. Senator BURNS substitute amendment to H.R. 2779, the version passed by the House, conforms the bill with important recent improvements in Federal purchasing laws.

Mr. President, recent procurement reforms have directed agencies to use commercial specifications and standards for all agency purchases, including construction of Federal facilities. However, GSA's new construction design guide contains Government-unique metric specifications for concrete blocks, ceiling tiles, lighting fixtures, and so forth. We received information last fall, indicating that the new GSA metric building design requirements would cost 20 percent or more than commercially available items. Also, the electric fixtures manufacturing and concrete masonry industries have registered concern with us about significant harm from the GSA guide reliance on noncommercial items. This is inconsistent with the recent laws streamlining Federal procurement and the 1988 amendments to the Metric Conversion Act of 1975.

The Burns substitute amendment makes three important improvements in acquisition of Federal buildings. First, it ensures agencies conduct market research and design buildings to use commercially available components, allowing use of hard metric specifications as industry converts. Second, it allows Government to require hard metric specifications for concrete masonry and electrical fixtures when an agency head determines it is required and cost-effective. In making this determination, the agencies can take advantage of price analyses prepared to comply with recent modifications in the Truth in Negotiations Act. Third, it establishes a check-and-balance within each agency, an ombudsman, to review complaints. The ombudsman will review metrics-related complaints from prospective bidders on construction contracts. The bill makes clear that the ombudsman authority

does not undercut the bid protest authority of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, Senator BURNS' legislation should result in savings to the taxpayers, while still allowing the Government to convert to metrics in building construction in a cost-effective manner. I am cosponsoring this amendment and encourage its adoption. I want to thank Senators PRESSLER and HOLLINGS, the chairman and ranking member of the Commerce Committee and Senator GLENN, for working with us in drafting the substitute amendment. I would also like to commend their staff and, especially Senator BURNS' staff, for their work on this legislation.

● Mr. KERRY. I am pleased to cosponsor with my colleague from Montana, Senator CONRAD BURNS, the Senate substitute to H.R. 2779, the Savings in Construction Act of 1996. This important legislation will amend the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 to enable lighting and masonry companies in Massachusetts and around the country to compete for Federal contracts.

Under present law, each Federal agency is required to use the metric system in its procurements, grants, and other business related activities. In certain instances, the act requires that specific products be produced in round metric dimensions. This requirement effectively mandates that such products, known as ''hard-metric'' products, be slightly altered from their current dimensions, thus forcing companies to undergo costly retooling and other production changes if they intend to compete for Federal contracts. Though the act contains an exception where metric conversion is likely to cause significant cost or market loss to U.S. firms, this exception has been implemented too narrowly, and, therefore, the act has caused substantial hardship to segments of the electrical and concrete masonry industries in Massachusetts and elsewhere. Indeed, several companies in my State, such as Lightolier, Inc., in Wilmington, MA, have had to turn down opportunities to compete for Federal contracts because they could not feasibly manufacture the necessary materials according to hard metric dimensions.

The implementation of the Metric Act in this manner has ultimately resulted in the U.S. Government paying a substantially inflated price for basic products such as bricks and lighting fixtures because companies that do undergo the cost of producing hard-metric products for Federal contracts often offer the products at a premium.

This bill will make commonsense changes to the procurement process. It will allow Federal agency officials to require that concrete masonry and lighting products subject to Federal procurement be expressed in metric terms. However, agency officials will not be permitted to demand that such products be produced according to hard-metric specifications without first making specific findings that such requirements will save Federal dollars. In addition, to ensure that this bill is implemented in a commonsense manner, it requires each agency that awards construction contracts to designate a senior official as a ''construction metrication ombudsman.'' Among other things, the ombudsman would be responsible for reviewing and responding to complaints from prospective bidders, subcontractors, and suppliers relating to agency actions on the use of the metric system in construction contracts. The ombudsman also would be responsible for ensuring that the agency is not implementing the metric system in a manner that causes significant inefficiencies or market loss to U.S. firms.

I would like to thank the Commerce Committee ranking Democrat, Senator HOLLINGS, and his fine staff, Pat Windham, for their efforts in bringing this bill forward during this especially busy time as this 104th Congress is concluded. I wish to recognize the fine work of Senator PELL, whose continued dedication to metric conversion we all have come to admire. I also wish to thank Senator JOHN GLENN and Senator TED STEVENS and their staffs on the Governmental Affairs Committee. Finally, I wish to thank Senator BURNS for sponsoring the legislation in the Senate and for his continued persistence on this matter.●

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be deemed read a third time, and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I am just very pleased we can pass one that I will not have to object to. So, therefore, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I hear no objection. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 5417) was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 2779), as amended, was deemed read a third time and passed.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have no further requests at this time. Seeing no Senator seeking recognition at this moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RETIRING MEMBERS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I just wanted to take a moment to speak a few words about three of my colleagues in the House and Senate who are going to be retiring at the end of this year. I know many of us have spoken about our colleagues and there have been many fine words describing the attributes of those who have served here with such great distinction. It is very difficult to decide who you are going to talk about because there are so many fine people who have served here. I have chosen to talk about three people very briefly because, first of all, I know them quite well. I have worked with them. Second, because I think they exemplify the characteristics that American citizens would like to see in their public servants. Third, because in a way they are so different and yet they are all three so much alike in that the one word that describes each of the three of them is ''integrity.''

The reason I select these three people, one is from the House, one is a Democrat in the Senate, and one is a Republican in the Senate. My purpose for selecting these three people is, therefore, to illustrate that it does not matter which body you are in or which party you are in, you can serve the American people well if you have that characteristic of integrity and you can be respected by your peers as well.

The three people I want to say a word about are Senator HANK BROWN from Colorado, Senator PAUL SIMON from Illinois, and Representative BOB WALKER from Pennsylvania, all three of whom will be leaving at the end of this session. As I said, one could talk about many others. I heard some great statements about our colleague AL SIMPSON. I think we all get a smile on our face when we think of the many stories he has told us—and Judge HEFLIN and so many others. Again, let me focus on these three.

First, Senator HANK BROWN from Colorado is leaving after one term in the Senate. I find it interesting that he says he is leaving because the decisions that he is making now, he says, are just not as objective as they were when he first came. He feels that his decisions are now more influenced by having been in this body. Mr. President, I think all of us here would say that if HANK BROWN is concerned that he is not deciding things on an objective basis, it might say a great deal about the rest of us, because I am sure, Mr. President, you would agree there is not anybody in this body who tackles issues on a more objective basis than HANK BROWN.

He does not come with a great deal of bias. He certainly is not very partisan. He says what is right, what is wrong, what do I know about this and what should we do, and if he is the only one who takes that position, he takes the position because he thinks it is the right thing to do. When he thinks he has been, in effect, slightly corrupted by the institution in a political way, what does it say about all of the rest of us? I know we all hold ourselves up to his standard as being the standard for judging issues.

I just want to compliment Senator BROWN for being independent, for being